

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/207,188

Applicant(s)

Michon et al.

Examiner

S. Devi, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1645



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) S. Devi (PTO)

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Kenneth Sonnenfeld

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jun 14, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic

b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: All claims under examination, claims 80, 89, 90 and 93 in particular.

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The explanation that Mr. Sonnenfeld requested with regard to the 35 U.S.C. 112/second paragraph issue raised in the Advisory Action mailed 05/09/02 was provided, i.e., the indefiniteness associated with the "conjugates" being administered in dependent claims 89, 90 & 93, but a "conjugate" being administered in the independent claim 80. The pending 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph rejections were also discussed and the lack of evidence in the specification with regard to the conjugate eliciting a "protective" immune response was pointed out. Mr. Sonnenfeld brought up the prosecution of the parent case. He was reminded that, as indicated in one of the previous Office Actions signed by the TC Director, each case is prosecuted on its own merits.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

S. DEVI, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1645

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

S. Devi 06/14/02  
Examiner's signature, if required